



OFFICE *of the* ATTORNEY GENERAL
GREG ABBOTT

December 18, 2002

Mr. Claud H. Drinnen
First Assistant City Attorney
City of Amarillo
P.O. Box 1971
Amarillo, Texas 79105-1971

OR2002-7265

Dear Mr. Drinnen:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 173860.

The City of Amarillo (the "city") received a request for "access to and copies of the Amarillo Police Department's report from Sept. 21, 2001 concerning the death of Carl Glenn Wheat that involved an Amarillo College police officer." You argue that the city is not required to respond to the request. In the alternative, you claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.107¹, and 552.111² of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

You explain that the request states that it is submitted pursuant to the Federal Freedom of Information Act. You argue that the city is not required to respond to the request because the city is not subject to the Federal Freedom of Information Act. As a hyper-technical reading of chapter 552 does not effectuate its purpose, a written communication that can reasonably be judged to be a request for public information constitutes a request for

¹Although you do not raise this specific Government Code provision, you raise an argument that is sufficient to invoke section 552.107.

²Although you do not raise this specific Government Code provision, you raise an argument that is sufficient to invoke section 552.111.

information under chapter 552. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 497 at 3 (1988), 44 at 2 (1974). In this regard, we note that a request for information need not refer to chapter 552 of the Government Code or be addressed to the officer for public information. *Id.* Thus, as we find the present request to be a valid information request under the Public Information Act, we turn now to your arguments against disclosure.

Initially, we note that the submitted information is made expressly public under section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022 provides, in relevant part

(a) Without limiting the amount or kind of information that is public information under this chapter, the following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure under this chapter unless they are expressly confidential under other law:

(1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108[.]

The submitted information consists of a completed report, which is expressly public under section 552.022(a)(1). You do not claim that the submitted information is excepted under section 552.108. Therefore, you may only withhold the completed report if it is made confidential under other law. Sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code are discretionary exceptions to disclosure that protect the governmental body's interests and are therefore not other law that makes information expressly confidential for purposes of section 552.022(a). *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469 (Tex. App.-Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); Open Records Decision Nos. 630 at 4 (1994) (governmental body may waive section 552.107(1)), 551 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.103 serves only to protect a governmental body's position in litigation and does not itself make information confidential), 473 (1987) (governmental body may waive section 552.111); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). Therefore, the city may not withhold the completed report under section 552.103 of the Government Code. However, the attorney-client privilege and work product privilege are also found in Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence and Rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure, respectively. Recently, the Texas Supreme Court held that "[t]he Texas Rules of Civil Procedure and Texas Rules of Evidence are 'other law' within the meaning of section 552.022." *In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328 (Tex. 2001). This office has determined that when the attorney-client privilege or work-product privilege is claimed for information that is subject to release under section 552.022, the proper analysis is whether the information at issue is excepted under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 (attorney-client communications) or Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5 (work product). Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 5-6 (2002), 677 at 8-9 (2002). We will therefore consider whether the submitted information is excepted under these rules.

Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence provides:

A client has a privilege to refuse to disclose and to prevent any other person from disclosing confidential communications made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the client:

(A) between the client or a representative of the client and the client's lawyer or a representative of the lawyer;

(B) between the layer and the lawyer's representative;

(C) by the client or a representative of the client, or the client's lawyer or a representative of the lawyer, to a lawyer or a representative of a lawyer representing another party in a pending action and concerning a matter of common interest therein;

(D) between representatives of the client or between the client and a representative of the client; or

(E) among lawyers and their representatives representing the same client.

A communication is "confidential" if not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client or those reasonably necessary for the transmission of the communication. Tex. R. Evid. 503(a)(5).

Accordingly, in order to withhold attorney-client privileged information from disclosure under Rule 503, a governmental body must 1) show that the document is a communication transmitted between privileged parties or reveals a confidential communication; 2) identify the parties involved in the communication; and 3) show that the communication is confidential by explaining that it was not intended to be disclosed to third persons and that it was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client. Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the document containing privileged information is confidential under Rule 503 provided the client has not waived the privilege or the document does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in Rule 503(d). *Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ). Here, you have failed to demonstrate that the submitted report consists of a communication between privileged parties or reveals confidential communications. Thus, the submitted report may not be withheld under Rule 503.

You further claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure because it is attorney work product. An attorney's work product is confidential under Rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. Work product is defined as

(1) material prepared or mental impressions developed in anticipation of litigation or for trial by or for a party or a party's representatives, including the party's attorneys, consultants, sureties, indemnitors, insurers, employees, or agents; or

(2) a communication made in anticipation of litigation or for trial between a party and the party's representatives or among a party's representatives, including the party's attorneys, consultants, sureties, indemnitors, insurers, employees, or agents.

Tex. R. Civ. P. 192.5(a). Accordingly, in order to withhold attorney work product from disclosure under Rule 192.5, a governmental body must demonstrate that the material, communication, or mental impression was created for trial or in anticipation of litigation. *Id.* To show that the information at issue was created in anticipation of litigation, a governmental body must demonstrate that 1) a reasonable person would have concluded from the totality of the circumstances surrounding the investigation that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue, and 2) the party resisting discovery believed in good faith that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue and conducted the investigation for the purpose of preparing for such litigation. *See National Tank v. Brotherton*, 851 S.W.2d 193, 207 (Tex. 1993). A "substantial chance" of litigation does not mean a statistical probability, but rather "that litigation is more than merely an abstract possibility or unwarranted fear." *Id.* at 204. Information that meets the work product test is confidential under Rule 192.5 provided the information does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in Rule 192.5(c). *Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.-Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ). Here, you have failed to show that the information at issue was created for trial or in anticipation of litigation. Consequently, the city may not withhold the submitted information under Rule 192.5 as attorney work product.

We note, however, that the submitted report contains information that must be withheld under section 552.130 of the Government Code. Section 552.130 excepts from public disclosure information relating to a driver's license, license plate, or motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we have marked in the submitted document under section 552.130. The remaining submitted information must be released to the requestor.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at 877/673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.--Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at 512/475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code

§ 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Karen A. Eckerle".

Karen A. Eckerle
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KAE/sdk

Ref: ID# 173860

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Ms. Tori Durst, Editor
The Ranger
P.O. Box 447
Amarillo, Texas 79178
(w/o enclosures)